



Docket No. p6376

PATENT

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Patent Application of:
Tinku Acharya, et al.

Application No.: 09/199,836

Filed: 24 November 1998

For: **Color Interpolation for a Four
Color Mosaic Pattern**

Assistant Commissioner for Patents
Washington, D.C. 20231

Examiner: Luu, Thanh X.

Art Unit: 2878

7#1 amndt a
12/6/00
RECEIVED
DEC 04 2000
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800

RESPONSE A

Request for Reconsideration and Amendment under CFR §1.111

Assistant Commissioner for Patents:

In response to the Office Action dated 6 June, 2000, Applicants respectfully requests reconsideration of the above-identified patent application as amended below.

In the Claims

Please amend claims 1 and 9 as follows:

Claim 1, line 2: Delete "the". Delete "ratios of" and substitute therefor -- proportions--.

Claim 9, line 2: Delete "the". Delete "ratios of" and substitute therefor -- proportions--.

Remarks

Claims 1 - 16 are presently active, claims 1 and 9 having been amended by this amendment. In the office action dated 6 June, 2000 ("Office Action"), claims 1 and 9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter; and claims 1 - 16 were

rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hamilton, et al., U.S. patent no. 5,631,703, ("Hamilton") in view of Lu, et al., U.S. patent no. 5,805,217, ("Lu").

Claims 1 and 9 are amended to better point out and distinctly claim the subject matter. Claim 1 is amended to recite that the unit array has green, red, blue, and infrared pass filters in relative proportions of 4:1:1:2, respectively; and claim 9 is amended to recite that the unit array has yellow, magenta, cyan, and infrared pass filters in relative proportions of 4:1:1:2, respectively.

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of claim 1 - 16 over Hamilton and Lu for the following reason. Hamilton and Lu do not teach or suggest, either separately or in combination, a color filter array having an infrared pass filter. In particular, the suggestion of an infrared pass filter is absent in the prior art. This is because usually an infrared blocking filter is used in prior art imaging systems so that the imaging sensor is not affected by infrared radiation. In the present claims, however, an infrared pass filter is positively recited.

Consequently, it is believed that all claims in the present application are patentable over the cited prior art.

Respectfully submitted,

Seth Z. Kalson Dated: 20 Nov 2000

Seth Z. Kalson
Reg. no. 40,670
Attorney for Applicants and Intel Corporation (Assignee)